

MAR 10 1961 ✓

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION
& EDUCATION

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion

Rising Hopes for Arms Control

One of the most encouraging events in recent years was the conference on disarmament of Russian and American scientists held in Moscow early this winter. At least this is the impression created by the television report on Feb. 12 by the American representatives, who seemed to believe they had been able to break through the curtain of propaganda and misunderstanding of their Russian counterparts.

(We wonder why commercial television delayed so long in presenting such an important report; it was originally presented by educational television on Jan. 3.)

The importance of the report derives from the hopefulness generated by the conference of scientists (which will be reconvened on March 15), and from the eminence of many of our negotiators. Dr. Jerome Wiesner, President Kennedy's science advisor, and Dr. Walt Rostow, his special assistant on national security problems, were members of our delegation and enlightening reporters of the conference. Their hopeful words can be stated briefly. They found the Russian scientists genuinely interested in some kind of arms control. They assumed the scientists did not have the authority of the political leaders, but they also assumed that they could not possibly hold views that contradicted political opinion.

Our representatives believed that the genuine interest of the Russians in the negotiations was prompted by two chief concerns. The one was fear of the dispersal of nuclear capabilities to many

nations, even small nations, and the increasing peril of such dispersal. Our representatives felt that the Russians were particularly concerned about Germany, on our side, and China, on their side, getting or developing nuclear power. It was assumed that the Russians felt incapable of stopping China bilaterally, but more hopeful of doing it by an over-all agreement.

The other concern is an economic one: the Russians would like to use in economic competition the resources now required for the arms race. They actually have two twenty-year plans, the one assuming an arms agreement and the other assuming a continued arms race. They are, of course, prisoners of their dogma that communism will ultimately defeat capitalism in economic and political competition. They want "world dominance," no doubt, but not on military terms or by nuclear means, because they are confident of superiority in other fields. This dogmatic sense of superiority is actually a guard against an intentional nuclear attack.

The Russians find it difficult to understand our fears of a surprise attack, even as we believe that their fears are not justified. Have we not assured the whole world that we would not launch the first attack? Have they not given the same assurance? Here the mutual fears are what the scientists define as "symmetrical." It must be admitted of course that, amidst the assurances, Khrushchev frequently rattles his nuclear arsenal.

In the discussion on the danger of war by mis-

Vol. XXI, No. 3, March 6, 1961 \$5.00 per year; 25 cents a copy

adventure or miscalculation, it appears that the Russians do not fear a technical error so much as a political miscalculation. A technical error would be, for example, to mistake a meteor on a radar screen for a nuclear missile. A political miscalculation would result from either or both sides seeming to prefer nuclear war to defeat on a local issue (Berlin, for instance) and then not being able to back down from the implied threat.

The most hopeful aspect of the conversations was the willingness of the Russians at least to discuss the old bone of contention between us—inspection. There is now actually a possibility that this matter of whether inspection should precede or follow disarmament might be resolved by a formula that would initiate reduction of arms by stages, and more and more inspection by corresponding stages as arms are destroyed.

There is, of course, the possibility that the Russian scientists are more ready than the political leaders to entertain ventures of arms control. The scientists on both sides may be expected to be more acutely aware of the nuclear danger. In any case, they do not share the responsibility of the political leaders who must assume responsibility for the political hazards of any venture in mutuality across the terrible chasm of mutual fear. Here too the situation is "symmetrical." It is important to recognize the common human fears and apprehensions on both sides, no matter how much we resent Mr. Khrushchev's antics at Paris, the U.N. and Berlin.

In summary, there is a gleam of hope in the dark situation of nuclear peril that engulfs the world. It is reassuring, too, to note that the new Administration is exploring all possibilities with soberness, realism and lack of political pyrotechnics.

R. N.

RELIGION AND THE COLD WAR

IT IS good news when an American President says explicitly that religion should not be a weapon in the cold war. According to a recent *New York Times* dispatch, President Kennedy said precisely that: religion should not be viewed as a weapon in the cold war, but as a "great reservoir of spiritual resources for meeting the challenges facing the nation."

It takes Christian discrimination to hold to this view when our opponents are atheists. But the President's whole address, to an annual prayer breakfast in Washington, was discriminating, with

an emphasis on both religious freedom and religious conviction.

Mr. Kennedy's remarks would surprise many of the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church. They must also have surprised many of the Protestants at the breakfast, who are accustomed to other forms of religiosity in Washington.

J. C. B.

DELAYED ACTION

ONE OF the bravest books written in many a year is a brief symposium on the racial policies of the Union of South Africa by eleven Dutch Reformed pastors and theologians. The title, *Delayed Action*, is intended as a criticism of the Church, which has postponed too long action in behalf of racial unity within its life and of racial justice within the nation.

The sharpest chapter is by Professor B. B. Keet, one of the most influential theologians in South Africa. He calls for three steps by the Church. The first is that the churches "should let the state know that they no longer see their way clear to continue the *apartheid* policy, and to insist that a better way of solving our racial problems be sought." Secondly, they should call for conversations under the auspices of the government between the leaders of the races to consider what is best for this multi-racial country. Thirdly, if nothing comes of these conversations, the Church should undertake on its own to find a better solution of the national problems and lay it before the state.

Professor Keet rejected *apartheid* in his earlier writings, especially in *Whither South Africa*. He is quite clear that *apartheid*, even in its ideal form of separate development of the races in different territories without the domination of one race by another, is not now possible, and that the Church should seek to find an alternative to the present policy and its "bitter fruits."

All the essays call for prophetic witness in political life by the Church now. They all emphasize the scandal of racial division within the Church. Professor Ben Marais returns to a proposal that he made familiar, which allows for temporarily separate churches, similar to the separation of churches according to language, but he rejects wholly what he calls "exclusive *apartheid* churches."

There is some difference of emphasis among the writers as to whether the ideal *apartheid* without white domination is possible. But there is no un-

certainty about the evil of the political and economic subjugation of one race by another. Whatever the differing shades of opinion, however, all the writers must have known that they would be bracketed in the public mind with those who take the strongest position against *apartheid* as such.

One fine statement is a protest against what is called "invisible unity" in the Church, a doctrine with which some white Christians seek to maintain the unity of the Church while they "avoid communion with non-white believers." Rationalizations of the color bar in the Church are refuted one by one, including the final argument that takes the form of the question: "Would you want your daughter to marry a Kaffir?" One writer says: "We as a people and we as a Church have turned Afrikaner Nationalism, and with it *apartheid*, into an idol."

This book is not the first indication that many Dutch Reformed leaders in South Africa reject the official racist ideology of the state, but it is the clearest and weightiest statement of this position that we have seen. It comes at the same time as the remarkable interracial conference of the churches of South Africa under the auspices of the World Council of Churches (see "Church News and Notes," Jan. 9).

We have received word that the book is having a very wide reading and that its authors, now referred to as "the eleven," are beginning to feel the burden of bitter criticism and even of ostracism in many places. They have shown all of us who live under easier circumstances what costly Christian prophecy is, and what the Church everywhere must do in relation to the principalities and the powers that seek to use it for their purposes.

J. C. B.

MUZZLING HOLLYWOOD

PROTESTANTISM is like democracy in that it is tempted to betray its own principles when its cherished beliefs come under attack. The Republic was tempted into such betrayal during the McCarthy period, and a similar temptation is occasioned for American Protestantism today by the change in morals reflected in the mass media.

Because Hollywood has recently grown more frank in the depiction of "sex and violence," to use the common phrase, and because the Supreme Court has handed down a series of opinions that allow considerably more freedom than formerly, there is a growing demand for new and tighter censorship laws in many states and for new techniques to restrain Hollywood's more daring pro-

ducers. Among Protestants there appears to be a movement to establish a rating board that would classify films according to their moral content, somewhat in the manner of the National Legion of Decency, long sponsored by the Roman Catholic Church. Any such move would appear to us a betrayal of the spirit of Protestantism.

At its recent annual meeting, the Board of Managers of the Broadcasting and Film Commission of the National Council of Churches faced the issue under discussion, though it seems not to have made any clear-cut decision. *The New York Times* reported that the West Coast committee of the Commission proposed the establishment of "a full-time, three-man board to work in Hollywood to evaluate every screen play submitted to the Motion Picture Code Administration (the industry's office for the pre-censorship of its own films). Scripts would be rated, according to the plan, on a scale ranging from "approved for the family" to "totally objectionable." These ratings would, we suppose, be communicated to the Protestant rank and file. If Protestants could be induced to go by them, they would exercise a powerful restraint upon motion picture producers.

The proposal has been made at a time when the West Coast office seems to be fighting for its life. It has been the subject of controversy since its director fired a blast at Hollywood 18 months ago for too much immorality. Some members of the Commission have thought the attitude of the West Coast office too negative. They have charged that it has failed to recognize the virtues of some films that ought to be commended for dealing courageously with "adult" subjects and that the office is giving a false picture of Protestantism by conveying the impression that the Church's only interest in films is to inveigh against "dirt."

At the recent meeting there was a proposal to remove the West Coast office from the Commission entirely and to "kick it upstairs" in the National Council, where it would presumably starve for lack of funds. This proposal was rejected, but the rating-board proposal was referred to committee. One Commission spokesman was quoted anonymously as saying that it had no chance of adoption, since it "goes against the traditional Protestant stand against pre-production censorship."

We hope that the anonymous spokesman's prognostication is correct. At the same time, we hope that the Broadcasting and Film Commission, in rejecting the negative attitudes of the West Coast office, will not itself fall into a reverse sort of negativism. It is not enough to say "no" to the office

that is saying "no" to Hollywood. A positive action is required.

The action required is a full-fledged effort on the part of Protestant journalism to educate churchmen into the proper appreciation of films, including those that deal insightfully with adultery, homosexuality, violence, narcotics and other potentially harmful subjects. It would be wrong, even if possible, to stop public discussion of these subjects, for a revolution in morals is now under way, and if it is not attended to in the public forum, which includes film, theater and fiction, it will become even more violent and destructive than otherwise. The river of emotion attached to these subjects needs to be channeled. It cannot be blocked off.

That is not to say there are no immoral films. There are. But many of those, even the majority, have little to do with "sex and violence," and, even with regard to the latter problem, the aim of Protestants should be constructive education of the audience rather than negative restraints upon the industry.

At the present time no Protestant journal in America gives an appreciable amount of space to the reviewing of motion pictures in depth. There is some, but it is a tiny drop in a very large bucket. This fact reveals Protestantism to be flagrantly irresponsible. It shows that Protestant yearnings to put a muzzle on Hollywood are basically reactionary.

T. F. D.

Piety and Maturity In Labor-Management Relations

JAMES KUHN

P IETISTIC HAND-WRINGING is not particularly useful in helping "churches and people to be more relevant and effective in the field of labor-management relations." But such is the approach of a report issued by the National Council of Churches, *In Search of Maturity in Industrial Relations*, "Some Long-range Ethical Implications of the 1959-60 Dispute in the Steel Industry."

The report has much to commend it, first in providing material for information and guidance, and second, in even approaching so controversial an issue. However, it too easily condemns both sides with lofty, almost self-righteous impartiality, while failing to wrestle with the problem of coercive pressures that direct both parties' use of economic power.

As happens all too often when Christians address themselves to social problems, the authors have escaped their own and the public's responsibilities by admonishing others. They have weakened their report by not exploring the dilemmas that union, corporate and government leaders face if they are to exercise power responsibly. Unless we show greater appreciation of the structural limits within which men must act and of the requirements that press upon leaders, we run the risk of displaying gratuitous condescension in questioning their statesmanship or "maturity."

The men involved in industrial relations act as

responsibly as they have to, and perhaps even as responsibly as they can. They will not display a concern for public interest, whatever that may be, if they cannot. Admonishment and exhortation are irrelevant; at most, the men must be required or at least allowed to consider public as well as private interests in industrial relations. Incessant demands of stockholders, customers and suppliers press upon corporate managers, and the constant necessities of democratic politics limit union officers. These men can afford to respond to a public interest as they bargain with each other only if the cost of not doing so is great enough to impress them. And the public can safeguard its interests only if it is willing to bear the cost of impressing its will.

"Power Against Power"

Labor and management meet in an encounter of power where vital interests, rights and prerogatives are at stake. Management has always wielded great economic power over workers. Its investment policies and production decisions create or destroy jobs and enlarge or contract employment opportunities. Its economic powers thus largely determine the welfare and livelihood of workers, but in an indirect, undramatic way, unquestioned by the public.

To check this power and its abuse, the Federal Government has encouraged and supported unions for nearly 30 years, allowing unions an economic power with which to challenge management's control over the work lives of their members. Basically that power is the ability to stop production when

MR. KUHN teaches industrial relations in the Graduate School of Business at Columbia University. His book, *Democracy in the Grievance Process* will be published by the Columbia University Press in May.

management wishes it to continue. Its most dramatic and public form is the strike. That workers are forced to resort to so powerful a weapon to insure participation in decisions affecting wages, hours and conditions of work is a measure of management's power and of its insistence upon free use of that power.

Reason and argument play a role in labor-management relations, but neither obviates the contention of power against power. Congress well understood that if it were to substitute for strikes another means of dispute settlement, it would not be rid of the power encounter between management and unions. The encounter would merely occur in new form with new and different costs.

In a pious spirit the report seriously questions the value of strikes and then looks only for negative answers. The approach is summed up in its introduction:

But it seems clear enough that our society, though still maintaining the basic right to strike, has advanced to the point where work stoppages will increasingly be felt to have outlived their usefulness. . . . The Christian Gospel is concerned with peace. Industrial peace does not imply the absence of heated discussion or widely serious differences of opinion. Industrial peace does imply, from the Christian standpoint, the gradual evolution of sound and just substitutes for the use of economic force in the settlement of disputes without frequent or prolonged strikes.

The report goes on to stress again and again the costs of the steel strike, using these phrases: "paralyze the economy and cause disaster," "tremendously expensive," "disastrous public effects" and "heavy price." These costs are assumed but not documented, however, and any offsetting benefits of the strike are ignored.

The costs of strikes are easily exaggerated, particularly those of a steel strike. A strike that shuts down a basic industry catches the attention of a whole nation. Its unusualness provides few standards by which to measure it, and the idleness of millions of tons of steel-making capacity and of half a million workers looms large when reported in newspapers day after day.

Did steel consumers suffer during the strike? The impact on them was slight. Anticipating a shutdown, they had built up inventories to tide them over, and on the whole managed quite well. When the President declared an emergency after 116 days, steel inventories had not yet fallen to the over-all level to which they dropped in the last months of the same year. Whatever production was lost as a result of the strike was quickly made up in early 1960.

The economy would have borne the costs of

idled men and mills, though, whether there had been a strike or not. With a grim element of truth, wags suggested that steel workers had simply decided to draw strike rather than unemployment pay. The record of steel production before and after the strike arouses suspicions that the attractiveness of price stability in a poor market made a strike not wholly unwelcomed by steel management.

Two Ways to Restrict Production

The year before the strike, steel mills had run at more than a third below capacity, and nearly one out of five steel workers had been unwillingly unemployed. Even with the strike in 1959, the industry produced over 8 million more tons of steel than it had in 1958. This last year, 1960, again facing a poor market once strike-depleted inventories had been filled, management cut back production month after month until in December the industry operated at the lowest rate in 22 years. While we enjoy a steel capacity 70 per cent greater than that of 1950, the industry produced about as much in 1960 as it did a decade ago and 24 million tons less than in 1955.

We might ask ourselves if it is the cost of strikes in lost production that alarms us or if it is the means used to stop production. Managers, not workers or union, reduced production in 1958 and restricted annual output more than the workers were able to in the longest steel strike in history. Managers, not workers, have idled half of our steel-making capacity these past months.

Who saw in 1958's or 1960's steel production and high unemployment a national disaster? Who sees in present production a national emergency? A few perhaps, but they are supported by no public outcry that the loss of steel production is "paralyzing the economy" or "causing disaster." No voice but the unions' complains of the "heavy price" paid by 125,000 presently unemployed steel workers in towns like Youngstown, Pittsburgh and Gary. One cannot lightly dismiss the cost of the steel strike, but in the perspective of regular business recessions, which we take in stride, it loses its fearsomeness. It is manageable—even acceptable—in our wasteful economy.

Avoiding a hysterical, impressionistic measurement of strike losses allows one to consider more calmly the lessons of the strike—its benefits as well as its costs. The report discovers three discouraging lessons: (1) that neither union nor management leaders displayed a "basic desire to reach an agree-

ment in harmony with the public interest," (2) that government intervention and existing legislation were unsatisfactory, and (3) that neither side used mass communications media honestly. The second and third lessons can hardly occasion much surprise, though the report performs a needed service in calling our attention to them and in proposing remedial action that bold church people might take.

In setting forth the first lesson the authors of the report too easily assume that public interest may be identified and agreed upon. Perhaps it may, by churchmen, but even they may entertain a partial view of the needs and interests of the many publics that make up our society. In abstract, the report wishes to further two interests: increased productivity and regard for worker welfare on the job. In practice the two conflict, providing no clear guide to action in factory and mill.

The public may prefer to ignore the conflict, but unless the issues are brought to public attention, argued and evaluated, there can be no genuine agreement on the public interest. If the public is deaf to the demands of one or another group, that group may be able to secure a hearing only by using economic force. If the conflict is a basic one, as this is, touching the very power and well-being of the contending parties, and if the public has not yet decided which interest should prevail, open disagreement, costly controversy and overt economic force will be needed to secure an agreement. Unable to appeal to a public policy or community consensus, and unable to compromise their interests voluntarily because of impinging responsibilities and obligations, each party must test the fundamental strength and resolution of the other. Thus is public interest hammered out and public policy determined.

The Fight for Security

The great lesson of the steel strike is not among the three mentioned in the report; rather it is that in our all-consuming passion for increased efficiency—greater productivity—all of us have forgotten the burden imposed upon blue-collar workers. The bitterness of the strike and willingness of workers to sacrifice four months' needed income reminds the nation that workers still must, and will, fight for a measure of assurance and security in a highly unstable and insecure work world.

Besides the fear of cyclical unemployment that haunts our industrial world, technological change relentlessly stalks the routine of work, bumping

workers from old to new jobs and displacing others entirely. In steel, managers have always been free to change work rules and to eliminate workers by improving machines or introducing new equipment and processes. For example, technical improvements allowed the steel industry to produce in the first half of 1959 six million more tons of steel, annual rate, with 31,000 fewer production workers than in 1955. (For this same freedom to introduce technological change, Harry Bridge's longshoremen exacted from the West Coast shipping employers a multi-million dollar fund to which contributions will be made year after year.)

The strike demonstrated that furnace tenders and mill hands will grimly protect their work rules and petty idleness on the job; apparently they do not understand the higher morality of a society that benignly tolerates the mass idleness of unemployment and disapproves their few minutes or hours of idleness and rest in the midst of heavy, tiring work. Receiving little protection and help from others, they try to protect themselves as best they can in the ways most available to them.

The long fight of the steel workers called public attention to the growing problem of technologically displaced workers in all industries. Jobs have disappeared on railroads at the rate of 1,000 a week over the past ten years. Employment in coal mining has declined at the rate of 90 men a day over the past decade. In three years, 1956-59, machines eliminated at least 56,000 jobs in automobile plants.

The Negro, the older man and the less skilled worker increasingly face long term unemployment. While all of us enjoy the increased productivity that displaced him, he alone must bear the cost of finding a new job, probably at lower pay, if he finds one at all, of retraining himself or of moving his home and family. At best he is helped by exceedingly modest unemployment benefits and scandalously low severance pay.

The lesson of the steel strike is that we have not lived up to our responsibilities to those who bear the cost of our improved well-being. We extend little help to displaced workers, offer little aid to depressed areas, and show slight interest in using the abilities and efforts of all our citizens to the fullest.

Christians might ask themselves how responsive *they* are to the needs of neighbors and how maturely *they* have responded to the great steel strike. Let us not shrink from the use of power and economic force; let us not decry it too soon. How else shall we be roused from our complacency?

Abortion in Norway: A Comment

FRANKLIN LITTELL

In October 1960, the Norwegian Parliament ("Odelsting") passed a piece of legislation which illustrates again how completely important issues of public morality and ethics are becoming the preserve of specialists and technicians. After 11 hours of debate, by a vote of 61 to 34, the Parliament passed a liberalized provision for induced abortion on social grounds. Such abortion may now be permitted in cases "where it is necessary in order to protect the life and health of the woman against serious danger. In evaluating such danger any special disposition of the woman with regard to physical or psychical diseases should be considered as well as her living conditions and other circumstances likely to make her ill or contribute to give her a physical or psychical breakdown."

Christian forces which had opposed the bill referred to its passage as a downward slide. A Christian daily in Oslo pointed out that the practical application of the law is placed in the hands of the Norwegian physicians and that it is now up to them, their conceptions of life and their sense of responsibility, what the effect of the Act may be.

Church News from the Northern Countries
(Sigtuna, Sweden, Nov. 23, 1960, No. 62, p. 6)

FROM ONE point of view this news note is but one more evidence of the progressive secularization of the West. Norway, officially a Lutheran land, is like the rest of northern Europe—a wasteland of fallen attendance, neglect of the means of grace, lively anti-clericalism. The number of those in militantly anti-Christian movements is approximately equal to the percentage of communicants regularly attending and participating. The vast majority of the population is indifferent, blowing neither hot nor cold on matters religious. And here we have another important theological issue that has been removed by law from the control or direct influence of the Church.

If this is the whole story, and it may turn out to be so, the only position for a loyal Christian must be that of flat opposition. The doctrinaire stand of the Roman Catholic Church on abortion is surely preferable to the abandonment of the whole issue to the jungle of mechanistic relativism. If, as some medical men frankly state in private, the doctor's role is simply that of a "well-trained plumber," such a law is immoral and the administration of it will be irresponsible.

The only way to avoid moral anarchy, with all that it implies in the disintegration of the social bond, is through the emergence of a new breed of "lay theologians" in the medical profession. The danger is not that the decision has been taken out of the hands of canon lawyers and professional theologians: this might, indeed, advance Christian

ethics. It might be that decisions would be based on attention to the will of God for specific persons and events rather than on the elucidation of "timeless truths" and abstract principles supposedly good for all times and places, but in fact all too often cruel or irrelevant.

The real question is whether the Norwegian Church is producing "lay theologians" in the medical profession or not. Here the prognosis is not too bright. Although there are two lay institutes and another in process of formation, they are far from influencing Norwegian public life to the degree that the German Evangelical Academies or Dutch *Vormingscentren* have weighted decisions in those two countries since the war. As a state church, the Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Church suffers from the customary debilitation due to traditional privilege and prosperity.

During the 19th century a series of revival movements gained wide response among the common folk, and most of the pious people of Norwegian Lutheranism are Pietists. Their religion is personal and familiar, with little significant public life except for the usual antipathy to smoking, card playing, dancing and drinking.

In recent years their chief policy seems to have been to oppose ecumenical cooperation, in the World Council of Churches and even the International Missionary Council. There is a conspicuous shunning of social and political responsibility—"Keep the church out of politics!"—except for traditional Protestant anti-Catholicism and occasional anti-Semitism. "Witnessing" is primarily verbal, rather than related to real vocational choices

DR. LITTELL teaches church history at Perkins School of Theology in Dallas, Texas. He has recently examined the European lay movements in *The German Phoenix* (Doubleday).

and decisions. The anarchy in moral and ethical affairs is represented by the word to the generality, "Obey your own conscience!"

To relate these matters is to come near to describing the situation of American Protestantism as well as Norwegian. As doctors and lawyers and elementary schoolteachers and civil servants are given authority to decide essentially theological issues, the comparative puerility of Protestant moralism becomes more and more evident.

The vocation-centered conference, which brings to bear on specific issues the commitment to professional ethics and morals, on the one side, and the Christian imperatives, on the other, is the best approach we now have to bring a new breakthrough in Christian social witness.

Special Africa Issue

Our next issue will be a special twelve-page number devoted to Africa. It will feature articles by:

'BOLA IGE, a young Nigerian Christian leader, who will write on Africa in the Sixties.

"Political independence is only minimum elbow-room which our countries need to develop their human materials and resources; it is only by starting in this political area that we can recapture something authentic of ourselves, purge ourselves of those built-in systems that almost made robots of us, and thus emerge as new personalities."

ROBERT C. GOOD, coordinator of President Kennedy's task force on Africa, will discuss the danger of disillusionment with Africa.

"Paradoxically, our trouble rises from our fine anti-colonial and liberal traditions. . . . But we are only beginning to realize that, far from a solution to the problems of disorder, and far from the guarantor of amicable relations, the era of independence-for-everyone simply reshapes the frame within which the persistent problems of politics must be viewed."

Quantity rates (10¢ each for orders of 11 or more) will be available for conferences, study groups and classes if orders are placed promptly.

CORRESPONDENCE

Cast the First Epithet

TO THE EDITORS: In "The New Orleans Outbreak" (Dec. 26), you point out the tragedy of the situation in a forceful manner, but I would suggest you may need to consider the manner in which you do it.

You let us know, as we already had known, that the people in New Orleans on *our* side are "good," "loyal," "respected," "inspiring," have "quiet courage," "fortitude," "sanity," represent "justice," and preach great sermons on "brotherly love." We are, in our self-righteousness, indeed grateful that these "good" ones in New Orleans (and we) are not like those others standing on the other side of the question who are, according to your editorial, "ugly," "hysterical," "vilifying," "ragtale female vigilantes," "banshees," "evil," "self-righteous," "hecklers," who possess "bestiality," "raw fury," and distorted faces." . . .

Your editorial comments on the irony in the segregationists using their conscience to support their evil. . . . Could it be that your editorial, in tenor and type, is another example of "evil done in the name of conscience"? To present the case for brotherly love by vilifying its opponents is irony at its most ludicrous.

PROF. GENE W. BRICE
Evangelical Seminary of Puerto Rico
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico

CHRISTIANITY and CRISIS

A Christian Journal of Opinion
537 WEST 121 ST. • NEW YORK 27 • N.Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR and JOHN C. BENNETT, <i>Chairmen</i>	
WAYNE H. COWAN, <i>Managing Editor</i>	
ROBERT G. BATSON, <i>Assistant Editor</i>	
M. SEARLE BATES	WALDO BEACH
AMOS WILDER	
ROBERT MCAFEE BROWN	F. ERNEST JOHNSON
ROGER L. SHINN	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
RICHARD T. BAKER	J. OSCAR LEE
TOM F. DRIVER	ROBERT W. LYNN
KENNETH W. THOMPSON	WILLIAM LEE MILLER

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HENRY SMITH LEIPER	JOHN A. MACKAY
FRANCIS P. MILLER	M. M. THOMAS
WILLIAM F. MAY	J. B. DUROSELLE
HERBERT BUTTERFIELD	SIDNEY LANIER

CONTENTS

PIETY AND MATURITY
IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS
JAMES KUHN
ABORTION IN NORWAY: A COMMENT
FRANKLIN H. LITTELL

1961
DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY
PHIL-RELIG & EDUC PER
5201 WOODWARD AVE
DETROIT 2 MICH 48202
9-018